



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/622,631

07/21/2003

Manuel R. Silva JR.

052250-5003

4556

56851

7590

08/06/2007

TYCO ENGINEERED PRODUCTS & SERVICES
ATTN: INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW DEPARTMENT
9 ROSZEL ROAD
PRINCETON, NJ 08540

EXAMINER

GORMAN, DARREN W

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3752

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/06/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/622,631	SILVA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Darren W. Gorman	3752	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Darren W. Gorman. (3) _____

(2) David Baltazar. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 26 July 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 2-134, 136 and 138-153.

Identification of prior art discussed: Hodgman, USPN 2,155,990.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Interview was conducted to discuss the supplemental amendment filed July 23, 2007. The supplemental amendment was filed by Applicant in an attempt to get previously withdrawn claims rejoined because of a previous telephone conversation between Applicant and the Examiner where the Examiner verbally indicated that claim 51 is allowable, as amended in the response filed June 13, 2007. During the July 26, 2007 conversation, the Examiner agreed with Applicant's assesment that claim 51 is currently generic to the species shown in Figures 3A-3F, Figures 4A-4E, Figures 5A-5F, Figures 6A-6F, Figures 8A-8F and Figures 12A-12E, as remarked in Applicant's supplemental response filed July 23, 2007. The Examiner also went through each of the pending claims (2-134, 136 and 138-153) with Applicant as follows. Claims 2, 3, 5, 8, 10, 12-14 and 16-26 were proposed by the Examiner to be canceled because of their dependency on canceled claim 1. Claims 36-47 were proposed by the Examiner to be canceled because they recite limitations which are mutually exclusive from limitations recited in independent claim 152, from which they depend. Claims 52-54 and 58-134 were proposed by the Examiner to be canceled because none of these claims depend from or otherwise require all of the limitations of an allowable claim (see MPEP 821.04(a)). Claims 4, 6, 7, 9, 11 and 15 were amended in the supplemental response to depend from claim 51 and are subject to being rejoined pending allowance of claim 51 (it was noted that some of these dependent claims would require amending to obviate informalities and potential issues under 112, second paragraph, should claim 51 be allowed). Claims 27-35, 48-50, 55-57, 136 and 138-153 remain allowed. After the initial telephone interview on July 26, 2007 was completed, the Examiner continued to review the instant application and came to the determination that claim 51 does not in fact read over the prior art of record to Hodgman (US Patent No. 2,155,990). The Examiner contacted Applicant to regretfully retract the verbal indication of allowability of claim 51. The Examiner also indicated willingness to continue telephone negotiations and consider proposals to amend claim 51 in order to clearly read over the prior art to Hodgman. The Examiner and Applicant briefly conversed again on July 31, 2007 and agreed to discuss the above situations further at a later date, since the Examiner will be on leave until August 13, 2007.